

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the office action dated March 1, 2011.

Claims 11, 18, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. These claims use the term "asynchronously," which is not explicitly disclosed in the specification. These claims are amended to remove the rejected terminology.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. This claim uses the term "said computing device," which has no antecedent basis. Claim 11 is amended herein to correct this error.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 USC §101 as failing to be directed to statutory subject matter. Claim 24 is amended herein to be directed to a "non-transitory" computer-readable medium.

Claims 11-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,245 by Takahashi (hereinafter Takahashi) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194 by Lobiondo (hereinafter Lobiondo) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,914,693 by Kirkeby (hereinafter Kirkeby).

This rejection fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness as the cited art does not teach all elements of the rejected claims. Claim 11 is an independent claim. Claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 depend from claim 11. Claim 11 comprises at least one element that is not taught in the combination of Takahashi, Lobiondo and Kirkeby.

In this rejection, the examiner relies on Takahashi to teach the element of "transmitting said driver-dependent data to a printer driver." The examiner cites Takahashi (col. 26, lines 22-26) as teaching this element. However, Takahashi, at this location and elsewhere, teaches sending this combined data to a document server (col. 26, line 25). The claim specifically described transmission to a printer driver. A printer driver is a program that controls a peripheral printing device by translating commands from a host application into printer-specific commands. A printer driver performs a very specific function and is logically located in a specific location in the data stream between the host device and the printer. Definitions of the term "driver" and "printer driver" are submitted herewith to prove this point. Takahashi clearly teaches that the job output from the input job control section 1202 is supplied to the rasterize image processing (RIP) sections 1203a, 1203b. It should be noted that a RIP section is not a printer driver. A raster image processor converts a vector-based image to a bit-mapped image. The RIP process is typically performed by a RIP processor in the printer, such as with a Postscript printer (col. 18, lines 60-65). Accordingly, the RIP process generally takes place downstream from the driver in the printer hardware itself, a different component. Therefore, the RIP process of Takahashi is not equivalent to the driver of the present claims and the cited art does not teach this claim element.

Claim 11 further claims " creating spool data from said driver-dependent data, using said printer driver." Since Takahashi does not teach the printer driver it cannot teach the creation of spool data using the driver. Accordingly, this element is not disclosed either.

Claim 11 further claims "wherein said spool data consists of a print task ticket specifying capability requirements of the print task and the driver-dependent data, and wherein said spool data is compatible as input to specific printer drivers corresponding to each of said specific printing devices." In his rejection, the examiner relies on Takahashi (col. 26, lines 22-26) as teaching this element. However, Takahashi, at this location, discloses printing parameters transmitted with image data to the document server. It should be noted that Takahashi teaches transmitting a combined print parameter/image data file from the application to the server. At this point in the Takahashi method, the file is not processed by the driver as spool data compatible as input to specific printer drivers. The document in Takahashi has not yet been processed by the server. The rejected claim element is very specific in designating the element creating the spool data, the printer driver, and the compatibility of the file. Accordingly, the document cited in Takahashi is not equivalent to the claimed element.

Claim 11 also claims "each of said specific printer drivers spools said device-dependent data portions to said print system component." Here, it should be noted that the drivers are processing the spool data into printer specific data and spooling the processed data to the print system component. This is the same print system component, described previously in the claim, to which the print task was originally sent in the first element of this claim. The examiner cites Takahashi (col. 30, lines 23-26) as teaching this element. However, Takahashi, at this location, teaches that monochrome and color MFPs output print jobs. Takahashi does not teach, at this

location or others, the spooling of the print data from multiple, parallel drivers back to the same print system component to which the original print task was sent. The methods of the presently claimed invention are very different from those of Takahashi. While Takahashi teaches a system that accomplishes a similar function, the methods employed are very different. The examiner cites similar functions in Takahashi, but the details of the claim elements clearly distinguish from the disparate methods in Takahashi.

The examiner further cites Kirkeby (col. 6, lines 56-58) as teaching the element of "concurrent parallel playback." However, it should be noted that the claimed element describes concurrent parallel playback of spool data to printer drivers. These are specific limitations on the playback element. Kirkeby teaches concurrent server functions such as fax job status messaging, fax records access, receiving TIFF files, receiving a fax message and other functions. Kirkeby does not teach any concurrent parallel playback of spool data to multiple printer drivers. Accordingly, the combination of Takahashi, Lobiondo and Kirkeby does not teach several elements of the presently claimed invention.

Claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 are patentable for the reasons stated above in relation to claim 11.

The examiner has rejected claims 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,245 by Takahashi (hereinafter Takahashi) (as modified by Lobiondo and Kirkeby) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,394 by Fukushima (hereinafter Fukushima). Claims 14 and 17 depend from claim 11 and comprise all the elements therein.

Claim 11, as stated above, comprises several elements that are not taught in the combination of Takahashi, Lobiondo, Kirkeby and Fukushima. These claims comprise elements, by dependence on claim 11, related to specific spooling and distribution processes carried out by printer drivers, which are not taught in the cited prior art. Fukushima does not teach these elements, therefore, the combination of Takahashi, Lobiondo, Kirkeby and Fukushima does not teach these elements.

The examiner has rejected claims 18, 19, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,245 by Takahashi (hereinafter Takahashi) (as modified by Lobiondo and Kirkeby) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,624,909 by Czyszczewski et al (hereinafter Czyszczewski).

Claim 18, 23 and 24 are independent. Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18. This rejection fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness as the rejected claims comprise elements that are not taught in the combination of Takahashi, Lobiondo, Kirkeby and Czyszczewski.

As explained above in relation to claim 11, these claims comprise elements not taught in the cited prior art.

Claim 18 comprises: "creating spool data from said driver-dependent data, using said printer driver, wherein said *spool data consists of a print task ticket specifying capability requirements of the print task and the driver-dependent data*, and wherein said spool data is compatible as input to specific printer drivers corresponding to each of said specific printing devices;" "despooling said spool data in accordance with said cluster printing selection wherein said despooling comprises distribution of said print task to said specific printing devices in substantial proportion to each of said specific printing device's output capacity , wherein said distribution results in creation of

distributed spool data portions and wherein said *despooling further comprises concurrent parallel playback of said spool data portions to said specific printer drivers* corresponding to each of said specific printing devices, wherein each of said specific printer drivers converts said distributed spool data portions into device-dependent data portions compatible with said corresponding specific printing devices and *each of said specific printer drivers spools said device-dependent data portions to said print system component;*" and

"despooling, with said print system component, said device-dependent data portions to said specific printing devices, wherein said *despooling with said print system component is performed in parallel.*"

Claim 23 comprises: "a driver for creating spool data from said driver-dependent data, wherein said *spool data consists of a print task ticket specifying capability requirements of the print task and the driver-dependent data*, and wherein said spool data is compatible as input to specific printer drivers corresponding to each of said specific printing devices;" "a despooler for despooling said spool data portions in accordance with said cluster printing selection wherein said despooling comprises distribution of said spool data portions to said specific printing devices in substantial proportion to each of said specific printing device's output capacity, wherein said distribution results in creation of distributed spool data portions and wherein said despooling further comprises *concurrent parallel playback of said spool data portions to said specific printer drivers*, wherein each of said specific printer drivers converts said distributed spool data portions into device-dependent data portions compatible with said corresponding specific printing devices and *each of said specific printer drivers spools said device-dependent data portions to said print system component;*" and "wherein said *print system component despools, said device-dependent data portions to said specific printing devices*, wherein said despooling with said print system component is *performed in parallel.*"

Claim 24 comprises "creating spool data from said driver-dependent data, using said printer driver, wherein said *spool data consists of a print task ticket specifying capability requirements of the print task and the driver-dependent data*, and wherein said spool data is compatible as input to specific printer drivers corresponding to each of said specific printing devices;" "despooling said spool data in accordance with said cluster printing selection wherein said despooling comprises distribution of said spool data portions to said specific printing devices in substantial proportion to each of said specific printing device's output capacity, wherein said distribution results in creation of distributed spool data portions and wherein said *despooling further comprises concurrent parallel playback of said spool data portions to said specific printer drivers*, wherein each of said specific printer drivers converts said distributed spool data portions into device-dependent data portions compatible with said corresponding specific printing devices and each of said *specific printer drivers spools said device-dependent data portions to said print system component*;" and "wherein said *print system component despools, said device-dependent data portions to said specific printing devices*, wherein said despooling with said print system component is *performed in parallel*."

Claims 18, 23 and 24 comprise elements related to: 1) spool data comprising a print task ticket with capability requirements combined with driver-dependent data; 2) a spooling process wherein spool data is spooled to multiple drivers, which process the data and spool back to the print system component and 3) despooling from the print system component to specific printing devices in parallel. These elements are not taught in the cited prior art as explained above in relation to claim 11. Claim 19 comprises these elements by dependence.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,245 by Takahashi (hereinafter Takahashi) (as modified by Lobiondo, Kirkeby and

Czyszczewski) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,082 by Takeoka et al (hereinafter Takeoka).

Claim 20 depends from claim 18 and comprises all the elements therein.

Claim 18 comprises at least one element that is not taught in the combination of Takahashi, Kirkeby, Czyszczewski, Lobiondo and Takeoka et al. This claim comprises elements related to specific spooling and distribution processes, as stated above, which are not taught in the cited prior art.

The examiner has rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,245 by Takahashi (hereinafter Takahashi) (as modified by Lobiondo, Kirkeby and Czyszczewski) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,891,632 by Schwartz (hereinafter Schwartz). Claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 18 and comprise all the elements therein.

Claim 18 comprises at least one element that is not taught in the combination of Takahashi, Kirkeby, Czyszczewski, Lobiondo and Schwartz. This claim comprises elements related to specific spooling and distribution processes, as stated above, which are not taught in the cited prior art.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C Krieger/

Scott C. Krieger
Reg. No. 42,768
Tel. No.: (360) 931-6406